

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-19, 21 and 22 were rejected. Claims 19, 21 and 22 were indicated as being allowable. Claims 1-18 have been canceled. Claim 19 has been amended to overcome certain objections. Claims 23-27 are new dependent claims that depend on allowable independent claim 19. Therefore, following entry of the present response, claims 19, 21 and 22-27 will be pending in the application, and be in allowable form.

Claims 1 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the office action suggests that "in claims 1 and 19 with the claim limitation reciting '... database item is checked out, the second program compares the version of the database item in the source code control (SCC) ...'. Do Applicants' mean '... database item is checked out and the second program compares the version of the database item in the source code control (SCC) ...'?" (*Office Action dated April 2, 2004 at p. 2*).

Claim 1 has been canceled. Claim 19 remains pending. Following a telephone discussion with Examiner Colbert, it was determined that the objected to claim language only appears in now-canceled claim 1, and does not appear in pending claim 19. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 4-13, 15-17, 19, and 22 are objected to because, according to the office action, "[i]t is unnecessary to have the SCC in parenthesis." (*Office Action dated April 2, 2004 at p. 3*). Applicants have canceled claims 1, 4-13 and 15-17. Applicants have amended

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0508 (37457.1)  
**Application No.:** 09/235,038  
**Office Action Dated:** April 2, 2004

**PATENT**

claims 19 and 22 to remove the "SCC" in parenthesis. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection of claims 19 and 22 because of the recited informalities.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,386,559 to Eisenberg *et al.* ("Eisenberg") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,558,413 to Schmidt *et al.* ("Schmidt"). Also, claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg and Schmidt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,145,119 to House *et al.* ("House"). In addition, claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over House in view of Schmidt. Claims 1-18 have been canceled.

Applicants have added dependent claims 23-27 to independent claim 19. Applicants note that dependent claims 23-27 do not raise new issues of patentability or require additional searching. Accordingly, applicants respectfully assert that claims 19, 21 and 22-27 are in allowable form.

Finally, applicant notes that during prosecution of the present application, U.S. Patent No. 4,809,170 to Leblang *et al.* ("Leblang") has been cited by the Examiner as prior art. However, Leblang has not yet been included on Examiner's form PTO-892. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that Leblang be cited as prior art on a form PTO-892.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0508 (37457.1)  
**Application No.:** 09/235,038  
**Office Action Dated:** April 2, 2004

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney Vincent J. Roccia at (215-564-8946).

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 4, 2004

---

Vincent J. Roccia  
Registration No. 43,887

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439